

## **Connecticut Manufactured Housing Association**

## Statement of the Connecticut Manufactured Housing Association in Opposition to H.B. 6780 – 'An Act Concerning Tenants' Rights'

The Connecticut Manufactured Housing Association (CMHA) is opposed to S.B.- 4. CMHA represents the owners of over 7,500 mobile home lots in Connecticut which is approximately three quarters of the lots in the state. Community owners are proud to offer a practical housing alternative for residents with limited financial resources. However, certain sections of the proposed bill would have negative consequences on community owners' ability to offer the existing standard of living to their residents. The proposed bill appears to enhance tenants' rights, while at the same time diminishing the rights of the community owner.

The proposed bill places additional burdens on the community owner in terms of time, costs, and responsibility. Specifically, the following provisions are objectionable:

- requiring walk through inspections prior to rental (Section 1)
- limiting application fees to the cost of a screening report (Section 2) and forcing owners to accept a tenant's copy of a previous screening report conducted within thirty days of the rental application and is satisfactory to the property owner (Section 2), and
- requiring landlords to provide notice to certain protected tenants of their legal rights concerning evictions (Section 3)

Making community owners conduct a walk-through inspection using the preoccupancy checklist prepared by the Commissioner of Housing infringes on the property owners' right to conduct business as they see fit. It also adds time to the existing rental process. Tenants have always had the opportunity to document the condition of a rental for their records and share it with the landlord.

As stated in testimony submitted for the public hearing on S.B. 4 – 'An Act Concerning Connecticut's Current and Future Housing Needs', CMHA opposes the prohibition on charging more than the actual cost for a tenant screening report in Section 7 of the proposed bill [S.B. 4]. In addition to the screening report, there are internal administrative costs associated with processing applications. Depending on the number of lots an owner has, these costs can be substantial. If the screening is not done properly, there is a greater risk that there will be major costs down the road in dealing with nonpayment issues and possible evictions. The bill further forces community owners to accept a tenant's copy of a previous screening report and forego any application fee. This opens the community owner to the possibility of having to except reports from inferior screening companies or reports that have been digitally modified. A less stringent screening process will put good tenants at risk of having residents in their communities that have not been thoroughly vetted.

Forcing landlords to be responsible for providing notice to certain protected tenants of their rights concerning evictions is beyond the scope of the owners' duties. There are government departments, agencies and commissions that are better suited for this task.

Thank you for your consideration of our position.

Respectfully,

## Nancy M. Palmisano

Nancy M. Palmisano Executive Director, CMHA P.O. Box 605 Bristol, CT 06011-0605 (860) 584-5915